



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/691,012

10/22/2003

Ole Buchardt

ISIS-5299

5682

32650 7590 10/21/2011

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP  
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR  
2929 ARCH STREET  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER

BORIN, MICHAEL L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1631

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/21/2011

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ecofficemonitor@woodcock.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/691,012	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BUCHARDT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MICHAEL BORIN	<b>Art Unit</b> 1631	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 34-36,38-41,43-45 and 47-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 34-36,38-41,43-45 and 47-73 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

Art Unit: 1631

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Status of Claims**

Response filed 07/14/2011 is acknowledged. There are no amendments to the claims. Claims 34-36,38-41,43-45,47-73 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.***

Rejection of claims 34-36,38-41,43-45,47-73 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is withdrawn in view of applicant's arguments. Examiner acknowledges the difference between "azo" moiety referred to in the rejection and "aza" moiety addressed in the claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first paragraph (enablement).***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1631

Claims 34-36,38-41,43-45,47-73 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for extra-cellular administration of the oligomers from the broad genus of a "polyamide nucleic acid oligomer containing neutral amide backbone linkages", does not reasonably provide enablement for *in vivo* extracellular administration that produces an intracellular biological response (such as modulation of protein expression).

The rejection is maintained for the reasons of record and further in view of the following response to applicant arguments.

Applicant argues that the Richelson patent (US 6,472,209) demonstrates enablement of the instantly claimed method. The Richelson patent has been extensively discussed in the course of prosecution of this application. As previously addressed, the Richelson reference is not considered because it is of post-filing date and enablement sufficiency of a specification is determined as of its filing date See MPEP 2164.05(a):

Publications dated after the filing date providing information publicly first disclosed after the filing date generally cannot be used to show what was known at the time of filing. *In re Gunn*, 537 F.2d 1123, 1128, 190 USPQ 402,405-06 (CCPA 1976); *In re Budnick*, 537 F.2d 535, 538, 190 USPQ 422, 424 (CCPA 1976) (In general, if an applicant seeks to use a patent to prove the state of the art for the purpose of the enablement requirement, the patent must have an issue date earlier than the effective filing date of the application.). While a later dated publication cannot supplement an insufficient disclosure in a prior dated application to make it enabling, applicant can offer the testimony of an expert based on the publication as evidence of the level of skill in the art at the time the application was filed. *Gould v. Quigg*, 822 F.2d 1074, 1077, 3 USPQ2d 1302, 1304 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

In general, the examiner should not use post-filing date references to demonstrate that the patent is non-enabling. Exceptions to this rule could occur if a later-dated reference provides evidence of what one skilled in the art would have known on or before the effective filing date of the patent application. *In re Hogan*, 559 F.2d 595, 605, 194 USPQ 527, 537 (CCPA 1977). If

Art Unit: 1631

individuals of skill in the art state that a particular invention is not possible years after the filing date, that would be evidence that the disclosed invention was not possible at the time of filing and should be considered. In *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513-14 (Fed. Cir. 1993) an article published 5 years after the filing date of the application adequately supported the examiner's position that the physiological activity of certain viruses was sufficiently unpredictable so that a person skilled in the art would not have believed that the success with one virus and one animal could be extrapolated successfully to all viruses with all living organisms. Claims not directed to the specific virus and the specific animal were held non-enabled.

Further, the reference does not providing information to show that a method as instantly claimed is supported by what was known at the time of filing. The instant method is directed to use of PNAs described in the claims as “polyamide nucleic acid oligomer containing neutral amide backbone linkages and a sequence of aza-linked ligands”. The specification specifically distinguishes such compounds from PNAs generally known in the art – see paragraph [0044] of PreGrant publication:

[0044] The peptide nucleic acids of the invention differ from those disclosed in WO 86/05518 in that their recognition moieties are attached to an aza nitrogen atom in the backbone, rather than to an amide nitrogen atom, a hydrazine moiety or a carbon atom in the backbone.

There is no evidence showing of use of such compounds in Richelson patent.

Contrary, as detailed in the rejection there is an ample evidence in the later-dated art demonstrating that the effect of *in vivo* administration of PNAs is unpredictable. As instructed in MPEP(see above), if individuals of skill in the art state that a particular invention is not possible years after the filing date, that would be evidence that the disclosed invention was not possible at the time of filing and should be considered.

Art Unit: 1631

With regard to Declaration of Dr. Geary filed 01/10/2011, the declaration offers a conclusory statement (Declaration, p. 2, paragraph #4):

Based upon my experience with compounds of this type, I believe that a person working in the field in 1991 would have been able to administer such a formulation to a mammal and would have had a reasonable expectation of achieving at least some measurable effect.

According to MPEP 2164.05 ("Determination of Enablement Based on Evidence")

The weight to give a declaration or affidavit will depend upon the amount of factual evidence the declaration or affidavit contains to support the conclusion of enablement. *In re Buchner*, 929 F.2d 660, 661, 18 USPQ2d 1331, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 1991) ("expert's opinion on the ultimate legal conclusion must be supported by something more than a conclusory statement"); *cf. In re Alton*, 76 F.3d 1168, 1174, 37 USPQ2d 1578, 1583 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (declarations relating to the written description requirement should have been considered).

In view to the evidence to the contrary as demonstrated in the later published art, the conclusory statement of the Declaration is not deemed sufficient to support the enablement of the claimed method.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1631

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Borin whose telephone number is (571) 272-0713. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marjorie Moran can be reached on (571) 272-0720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Borin/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1631

Application/Control Number: 10/691,012

Page 7

Art Unit: 1631